

position (page 9) that the test for obviousness is "not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference..." but "[R]ather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art." While Applicants agree, Applicants further note that each of the references must be read for their teachings in their entirety; one cannot select from a reference just as much as is necessary to reconstruct the claimed invention.

Thus, this is why Applicants compared a sensor with an outer layer prepared according to the only actual deposition method clearly disclosed by Friese et al, impregnation from an aqueous solution, with a sensor prepared according to the claimed invention. While Jones et al and Friese et al do teach a desirable goal, one cannot ignore the teachings of the references on how to achieve that goal, and still support an argument for obviousness. Simply put, one of ordinary skill in the art following the teachings of the references would have obtained an inferior sensor, and would have found the need to try something else. The something else which was tried by Applicants and found to be successful does not flow naturally from considering the teachings of these two references as a whole, but rather from ignoring the specific teachings of Friese et al to impregnate a sensor with an aqueous solution, and doing something else. The fact that Friese et al teaches an outer layer for trapping pollutants does not mean that this outer layer is the same as the outer layer which is presently claimed; indeed, Applicants have shown in the various tests that the outer layer is not the same.


Moreover, as has been demonstrated in allowed divisional application Serial No. 10/461,366, the sensors according to the invention present an advantage which is totally unexpected in light of the cited art. Thus, Applicants have discovered that the sensors of the invention are not only more resistant to poisoning than the sensors of the prior art, but also display a much greater baseline drift when poisoned, as compared with the prior art sensors. This discovery makes it possible to determine poisoning by observing baseline drift, without the need to actually calibrate the sensor with a test gas.

This advantage of the invention is discussed in considerable detail on pages 21 through 24 of the application. Even assuming *arguendo* that the invention were structurally obvious in view of the cited art, there would be no suggestion in the cited art that sensors prepared according to the invention would exhibit a large baseline drift upon poisoning, and enable one to determine if a sensor is poison without exposure to a test gas.

Thus, the references taken as a whole and read in their entirety do not disclose or suggest the structure of the claimed invention, and do not disclose or suggest the advantages to be obtained by the structures of the claimed invention. Withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira J. Schultz  
Registration No. 28666